

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 15, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, and 50 have been amended and claims 4, 28, and 51 have been canceled. Claims 18-22 and 42-46 were previously withdrawn. Claims 5, 11, 23-24, 29, 35, 47-49, and 52-53 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added. The claim amendments are supported at least by the description on page 55, line 18 – page 56, line 13 and Figures 30a-30f. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, and 50 are currently pending and subject to examination.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 28, 30-34, 36-41, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, 50, and 51 have been amended and claims 4 and 28 canceled responsive to this rejection. The Applicants note that the claim amendments are supported at least by the description on page 55, line 18 – page 56, line 13 and Figures 30a-30f. If any further amendment is required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 12, 17, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 12, 17, 25, and 36 have been amended responsive to this rejection. If any further amendment is required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed January 23, 2008, claims 1-2, 4, 6-10, 17, 23-26, 28, 30-34, 41, and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,441 to Handelsman et al. ("Handelman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,667 to Duga et al. ("Duga"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,754 to Knauff et al. ("Knauff") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 to Ginter et al. ("Ginter"). Claims 3 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handelsman in view of Duga in further view of Knauff in further view of Ginter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384 to Block et al. ("Block"). Claims 50-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,681 to Huffman et al. ("Huffman") in view of Handelsman, Duga, Knauff, and Ginter. Claims 12-16 and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handelsman in view of Duga, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,785 to Paepke and U.S. Patent No. 6,279,017 to Walker. It is noted that claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 15, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, and 50 have been amended and claims 4, 28, and 51 have been canceled. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

The Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination (not admitted), discloses or suggests a method for restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer that comprises at least the combination of features of determining at the viewer if the user is authorized to restrict access to the electronic books; if the user is authorized, displaying the electronic book on the viewer; receiving at the viewer an identification of restricted content from the user; saving a

restricted version of the electronic book, the restricted version including the original format of the electronic book; saving an unrestricted version of the electronic book, the unrestricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book and having portions of the original content deleted, the deletions based on the identification of restricted content from the user; and inserting a cross-reference to the unrestricted version of the electronic book in a header portion of the restricted version of the electronic book, as recited in amended claim 1.

In Handelman, as cited by the Examiner, a “document is typically received in several versions” and “conditional access information might include language control information, controlling what language version or versions are available or preferred for display.” See Handelman at column 17, lines 27-38. Handelman also describes restrictions “a restriction allowing a portion of the document to be viewed or only allowing the document to be viewed in a certain format, such restrictions being based typically on parental control limits.” See Handelman at column 18, lines 30-35. However, Handelman does not allow an authorized user at an electronic book viewer to select restricted portions of an electronic book and to store an unrestricted version of the electronic book, the unrestricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book and having portions of the original content deleted, the deletions based on the identification of restricted content from the authorized user.

Instead, Handelman teaches that typically various versions of a document are received, rather than presenting features allowing a user to create and store their own unrestricted version with personally selected deleted content.

The cited section of Knauff allows the insertion one or more keywords into a header portion of an electronic document. (Knauff, col. 16, lines 54-56). However, Knauff does not disclose or suggest inserting cross-reference information between a restricted version and an user created unrestricted version of an electronic book, as recited in amended claim 1.

Duga, Ginter, Huffman, Paepke, and Walker fail to cure this deficiency. None of these references, when taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the combination of the features of Claim 1, as amended.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10, 12, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, and 50 are also allowable over the cited art. As Claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 25, 34, 36, 41, and 50, as amended, are allowable, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 6-9, 13-16, 26-27, 30-33, and 37-40 are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into allowable form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to

Deposit Account No. 01-2300, with reference to Attorney Docket No. 026680-00029.

Respectfully submitted,
Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sheree Rowe".

Sheree Rowe
Registration No. 59,068

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395